UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,417	03/30/2004	Sumit Agarwal	16113-641001	1265

26192 7590 12/27/2007

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
PHAM, MICHAEL	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/812,417	AGARWAL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael D. Pham	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 October 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5,6 and 8-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5,6 and 8-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/9/07 has been entered.

Status of claims

2. Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-32 are pending

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The Information disclosure statements submitted November 16, 2005 as well as on March 2, 2007 has already been considered in view of the record.

Specification

6. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: what comprises a computer-readable medium is not in the specifications.

7. The phrase "computer-readable medium" is interpreted as a medium not including a form of energy or signals.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 30 and 31 recite "a system". Applicant's have provided evidence paragraph 0079, that the system may be hardware, software, or a combination thereof.

MPEP 2106.06:

The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an

algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because "[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. **Claims 1, 10, 17-18, and 24-27, 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Provisional Patent Application 60529245 by Hillis (hereafter Hillis) further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0107363 by Monteverde (hereafter Monteverde).**

Claim 1:

Hillis discloses the following claimed limitations:

"Selecting one or more evaluators to rate a document;"[page 5 line 10 user profile specifies which reputation systems the user considers reliable. Page 5 line 6-9, reputation systems return set of statistics and rating for content. Accordingly, selecting one or more evaluators (specifies which reputation systems) to rate a document (reputation systems return set of statistics and rating for content) is suggested.]

"Passing the document to the one or more evaluators;" [page 5 line 6, each reputation system returns a set of statistics for a given piece of content within the database. Accordingly passing the document (given piece of content) to the one or more evaluators (each reputation system) is suggested.]

"Receiving rating information associated with contents of the a document from the one or more evaluators;" [page 5 line 9, reputation system may return rating.]

"receiving a signal relevant to a criteria; and" [page 5 lines 22-23, a threshold may be set.]

"Determining whether to deliver the document in response to the signal based on the criteria and the aggregate rating." [page 5 lines 22-23, during searches for content, a threshold may be set and only content with an evaluation exceeding the designated threshold returned. Accordingly, determining whether to deliver the document (returned) in response to the signal based on the criteria (content with an evaluation exceeding the designated threshold) and the aggregate rating (rating information from one or more evaluators) is suggested.]

Hillis does not explicitly disclose

"Identifying at least one trust score, wherein the at least one trust score is associated with a specific one of the one or more evaluators;"

"Determining an aggregate rating for the document based on the rating information and the at least one trust score;"

However, Monteverde does disclose the following in figures 1 and 3. Figure 1 element 11 provides an analytical result thereby communicating the trustworthiness of an internet site. Figure 3 element 21 discloses criterion influence upon or relevance to the anticpated trustworthiness of the internet site. Figure 3 discloses that each criterion 21 has a numerical point value 22 which is assigned or awarded to the internet site if that criterion 21 is met.

Accordingly, identifying at least one trust score (figure 3 element 22, a point value), wherein the at least one trust score is associated with a specific one or more evaluators (figure 3 element 21, criteria); and determining an aggregate rating (figure 1 and 2 element 11, an analytical result) for the document (abstract, internet site) based on the rating information (figure 3 element 21, criteria) and the at least one trust score (figure 3 element 22, a point value) is suggested.

Both Hillis and Monteverde are directed to trust systems. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Monteverde's disclosure of the elements in figures 1 and 3 for the purpose of improving user trusts of internet sites and content.

Claim 10:

The combination of Hillis and Monteverde discloses in Hillis "The method of claim 1, wherein at least one trust score is based on an industry associated with the specific one of the one or more evaluators" [page 5 line 6, reputation system returns a set of statistics for a given piece of content. Page 5 line 8, statistics indicate the reliability and trustworthiness of the content.

Page 5 lines 11-12, for a given purpose, for example entertainment reviews, the reputation considered reliable are combined to determine an overall evaluation of the trustworthiness of the content].

Claim 17:

The combination of Hillis and Monteverde discloses in Hillis "The method of claim 1, wherein the document comprises at least one of a web page, content that can be used in a web page, and a program."[page 4 line 4, web based material]

Claim 18:

The combination of Hillis and Monteverde discloses in Hillis "The method of claim 1, further comprising: selecting one or more evaluators to evaluate the document." [page 5 line 10 user profile specifies which reputation systems the user considers reliable. Page 5 line 6-9, reputation systems return set of statistics and rating for content.]

Claim 24:

The combination of Hillis and Monteverde discloses in Hillis "The method of claim 1, wherein the aggregate rating comprises a quantity." [page 5 line 9]

Claim 25:

The combination of Hillis and Monteverde discloses in Hillis "The method of claim 1, wherein the aggregate rating comprises a mean of the rating information." [page 12 line 2]

Claim 26:

The combination of Hillis and Monteverde discloses in Hillis "The method of claim 1, wherein the aggregate rating comprises a mode of the rating information" [page 12 line 2]

Claim 27:

The combination of Hillis and Monteverde discloses in Hillis "The method of claim 1, wherein the aggregate rating comprises a median of the rating information." [page 12 line 2]

Claim 29:

Hillis discloses the following claimed limitations:

"Select one or more evaluators to rate a document;"[page 5 line 10 user profile specifies which reputation systems the user considers reliable. Page 5 line 6-9, reputation systems return set of statistics and rating for content. Accordingly, selecting one or more evaluators (specifies which reputation systems) to rate a document (reputation systems return set of statistics and rating for content) is suggested.]

"Pass the document to the one or more evaluators;" [page 5 line 6, each reputation system returns a set of statistics for a given piece of content within the database. Accordingly passing the document (given piece of content) to the one or more evaluators (each reputation system) is suggested.]

"Receive rating information associated with the content of the document from the one or more evaluators;" [page 5 line 9, reputation system may return rating.]

"Receive a signal relevant to a criteria; and" [page 5 lines 22-23, a threshold may be set.]

"Determine whether to deliver the document in response to the signal based on the criteria and the aggregate rating." [page 5 lines 22-23, during searches for content, a threshold may be set and only content with an evaluation exceeding the designated threshold returned. Accordingly, determining whether to deliver the document (returned) in response to the signal based on the criteria (content with an evaluation exceeding the designated threshold) and the aggregate rating (rating information from one or more evaluators) is suggested.]

Hillis does not explicitly disclose

"Identifying at least one trust score, wherein the at least one trust score is associated with a specific one of a plurality of evaluators;"

"Determining an aggregate rating for the document based on the rating information and the at least one trust score;"

However, Monteverde does disclose the following in figures 1 and 3. Figure 1 element 11 provides an analytical result thereby communicating the trustworthiness of an internet site. Figure 3 element 21 discloses criterion influence upon or relevance to the anticpated trustworthiness of the internet site. Figure 3 discloses that each criterion 21 has a numerical point value 22 which is assigned or awarded to the internet site if that criterion 21 is met.

Accordingly, identifying at least one trust score (figure 3 element 22, a point value), wherein the at least one trust score is associated with a specific one or more evaluators (figure 3 element 21, criteria); and determining an aggregate rating (figure 1 and 2 element 11, an analytical result) for

the document (abstract, internet site) based on the rating information (figure 3 element 21, criteria) and the at least one trust score (figure 3 element 22, a point value) is suggested.

Both Hillis and Monteverde are directed to trust systems. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Monteverde's disclosure of the elements in figures 1 and 3 for the purpose of improving user trusts of internet sites and content.

Claim 30:

Hillis discloses the following claimed limitations:

"Selecting means for selecting one or more evaluators to rate a document;" [page 5 line 10 user profile specifies which reputation systems the user considers reliable. Page 5 line 6-9, reputation systems return set of statistics and rating for content. Accordingly, selecting means for selecting one or more evaluators (specifies which reputation systems) to rate a document (reputation systems return set of statistics and rating for content) is suggested.]

"Passing means for passing the document to the one or more evaluators;" [page 5 line 6, each reputation system returns a set of statistics for a given piece of content within the database. Accordingly passing means for passing the document (given piece of content) to the one or more evaluators (each reputation system) is suggested.]

"Rating receiving means for receiving rating information associated with a content of the document from the one or more evaluators;" [page 5 line 9, reputation system may return rating.]

"Signal receiving means for receiving a signal relevant to a criteria; and" [page 5 lines 22-23, a threshold may be set.]

"Determination means for determining whether to deliver the document in response to the signal based on the criteria and the aggregate rating." [page 5 lines 22-23, during searches for content, a threshold may be set and only content with an evaluation exceeding the designated threshold returned. Accordingly, determining means for determining whether to deliver the document (returned) in response to the signal based on the criteria (content with an evaluation exceeding the designated threshold) and the aggregate rating (rating information from one or more evaluators) is suggested.]

Hillis does not explicitly disclose

Identifying means for identifying at least one trust score, wherein the at least one trust score;

Determining means for determining an aggregate rating for the document based on the rating information and the at least one trust score;

However, Monteverde does disclose the following in figures 1 and 3. Figure 1 element 11 provides an analytical result thereby communicating the trustworthiness of an internet site. Figure 3 element 21 discloses criterion influence upon or relevance to the anticpated trustworthiness of the internet site. Figure 3 discloses that each criterion 21 has a numerical point value 22 which is assigned or awarded to the internet site if that criterion 21 is met.

Accordingly, Identifying means for identifying at least one trust score (figure 3 element 22, a point value), wherein the at least one trust score is associated with a specific one or more evaluators (figure 3 element 21, criteria); and Determining means for determining an aggregate rating (figure 1 and 2 element 11, an analytical result) for the document (abstract, internet site) based on the rating information (figure 3 element 21, criteria) and the at least one trust score (figure 3 element 22, a point value) is suggested.

Both Hillis and Monteverde are directed to trust systems. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Monteverde's disclosure of the elements in figures 1 and 3 for the purpose of improving user trusts of internet sites and content.

Claim 31:

Hillis discloses the following claimed limitations:

"A selecting device operable to select one or more evaluators to rate a document;" [page 5 line 10 user profile specifies which reputation systems the user considers reliable. Page 5 line 6-9, reputation systems return set of statistics and rating for content. Accordingly, selecting means for selecting one or more evaluators (specifies which reputation systems) to rate a document (reputation systems return set of statistics and rating for content) is suggested.]

"A passing device operable to pass the document to the one or more evaluators;" [page 5 line 6, each reputation system returns a set of statistics for a given piece of content within the

database. Accordingly passing means for passing the document (given piece of content) to the one or more evaluators (each reputation system) is suggested.]

"A rating receiving device operable to receive rating information associated with a content of the document from the one or more evaluators;" [page 5 line 9, reputation system may return rating.]

"A signal receiving device operable to receive a signal relevant to a criteria; and" [page 5 lines 22-23, a threshold may be set.]

"A determination device operable to determine whether to deliver the document in response to the signal based on the criteria and the aggregate rating." [page 5 lines 22-23, during searches for content, a threshold may be set and only content with an evaluation exceeding the designated threshold returned. Accordingly, determining means for determining whether to deliver the document (returned) in response to the signal based on the criteria (content with an evaluation exceeding the designated threshold) and the aggregate rating (rating information from one or more evaluators) is suggested.]

Hillis does not explicitly disclose

"An identification device operable to identify at least one trust score, wherein the at least one trust score is associated with a specific one of a plurality of evaluators;"

"A determination device operable to determine an aggregate rating for the document based on the rating information and the at least one trust score"

However, Monteverde does disclose the following in figures 1 and 3. Figure 1 element 11 provides an analytical result thereby communicating the trustworthiness of an internet site. Figure 3 element 21 discloses criterion influence upon or relevance to the anticpated trustworthiness of the internet site. Figure 3 discloses that each criterion 21 has a numerical point value 22 which is assigned or awarded to the internet site if that criterion 21 is met.

Accordingly, an identification device operable to identify at least one trust score (figure 3 element 22, a point value), wherein the at least one trust score is associated with a specific one or more evaluators (figure 3 element 21, criteria); and a determination device operable to determine an aggregate rating (figure 1 and 2 element 11, an analytical result) for the document (abstract, internet site) based on the rating information (figure 3 element 21, criteria) and the at least one trust score (figure 3 element 22, a point value) is suggested.

Both Hillis and Monteverde are directed to trust systems. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Monteverde's disclosure of the elements in figures 1 and 3 for the purpose of improving user trusts of internet sites and content.

Claim 32:

Hillis discloses the following claimed limitations:

"Selecting a plurality of evaluators to rate a document;" [page 5 line 10 user profile specifies which reputation systems the user considers reliable. Page 5 line 6-9, reputation systems return set of statistics and rating for content. Accordingly, selecting means for selecting one or more evaluators (specifies which reputation systems) to rate a document (reputation systems return set of statistics and rating for content) is suggested.]

"Passing the document to the plurality of evaluators;" [page 5 line 6, each reputation system returns a set of statistics for a given piece of content within the database. Accordingly passing means for passing the document (given piece of content) to the one or more evaluators (each reputation system) is suggested.]

"Receiving rating information for associated with a content of the document from the plurality of evaluators," [page 5 line 9, reputation system may return rating.]

Hillis does not explicitly disclose

"wherein each evaluator is associated with a trust score; and"

"Determining an aggregate content rating for the document based on the rating information and the trust score associated with each evaluator."

However, Monteverde does disclose the following in figures 1 and 3. Figure 1 element 11 provides an analytical result thereby communicating the trustworthiness of an internet site. Figure 3 element 21 discloses criterion influence upon or relevance to the anticpated trustworthiness of the internet site. Figure 3 discloses that each criterion 21 has a numerical point value 22 which is assigned or awarded to the internet site if that criterion 21 is met.

Accordingly, wherein each evaluator (figure 3 element 21, criteria) is associated with a trust score(figure 3 element 22, a point value); and determining an aggregate content rating (figure 1 and 2 element 11, an analytical result) for the document (abstract, internet site) based on the rating information (figure 3 element 21, criteria) and the at least one trust score of the evaluator (figure 3 element 22, a point value) is suggested.

Both Hillis and Monteverde are directed to trust systems. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Monteverde's disclosure of the elements in figures 1 and 3 for the purpose of improving user trusts of internet sites and content.

12. Claims 3, 5, 6, 22-23, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Provisional Patent Application 60529245 by Hillis (hereafter Hillis) and U.S. Patent Applicatoin Publication 2004/0107363 by Monteverde (hereafter Monteverde) further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 20050144297 by Dahlstrom et. al. (hereafter Dahlstrom).

Claim 3:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose "wherein the signal is a request received from an entity, the entity is associated with a suitability standard, and the determining action comprises determining whether the document satisfies the suitability standard."

However, Dahlstrom teaches "the signal is a request received from an entity, the entity is associated with a suitability standard" [website is found to be appropriate], "and the determining action comprises determining whether the document satisfies the suitability standard." [See page 2, paragraph [0007] If the website is found to be appropriate for viewing based on the settings, the access request is sent to the computer network layering or protocol to which the original request was routed.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hillis and Monteverde with that of Dahlstrom because all are related to evaluating and regulating content on the internet and by including a suitability standard as disclosed in Dahlstrom, the ratings that are derived as disclosed in Hillis and Monteverde can be used to block access to inappropriate materials based on the standard for a particular user. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the signal is a request received from an entity, the entity is associated with a suitability standard, and the determining action comprises determining whether the document satisfies the suitability standard.

Claim 5:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose

"selecting the electronic document based on the aggregate rating and the suitability standard."

However, Dahlstrom teaches "selecting the electronic document based on the aggregate rating and the suitability standard." [See page 2, paragraph [0007] if the URL is found, a message including URL ratings for the website is sent to the client computer.... the client computer compares the URL ratings to the web access settings for the user attempting to access the Internet.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hillis and Monteverde with that of Dahlstrom because all are related to evaluating and regulating content on the internet and by including the addition of a suitability standard as disclosed in Dahlstrom, with the aggregate rating as disclosed in Hillis and Monteverde, appropriate relevant documents, based on the standard for a particular user, can be provided. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include determining an aggregate rating based on the rating information; and selecting the electronic document based on the aggregate rating and the suitability standard.

Claim 6:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose "storing the suitability standard in a database; and processing the database to determine the suitability standard."

However, Dahlstrom discloses, "storing the suitability standard in a database; and processing the database to determine the suitability standard." [See page 3, paragraph [0030] The cache 108 is preferably implemented as a text file or database that is stored in computer memory. And see page 3, paragraph [0031] the logic module 106 compares the URL ratings to the web access settings for the user attempting to access the Internet 101.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hillis and Monteverde with that of Dahlstrom because all are related to evaluating and regulating content on the internet and by including a database as disclosed in Dahlstrom, the method is more robust because multiple user suitability standards can be defined and stored for use on any computer where internet is being accessed. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "storing the suitability standard in a database; and processing the database to determine the suitability standard."

Claim 22:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose "the aggregate rating comprises one or more subject ratings, each associated with an evaluation criterion."

However, Dahlstrom discloses, "the aggregate rating comprises one or more subject [categories] ratings, each associated with an evaluation criterion." [See page 4, paragraph [0034] The web access settings defined at operation 218 in FIG. 2 are subdivided into multiple categories for better specification of the subject matter to which access is controlled.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hillis and Monteverde with that of Dahlstrom because all are related to evaluating and regulating content on the internet and by including one or more subject ratings, as disclosed in Dahlstrom, the method is detailed because it can be fine tuned for specific things to look for. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to include disclose "the aggregate rating comprises one or more subject ratings, each associated with an evaluation criterion."

Claim 23:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose "wherein the evaluation criterion comprises at least one of sexual content, violent content, adult content, and targeted age."

However, Dahlstrom discloses, "the evaluation criterion comprises at least one of sexual content, violent content, adult content, and targeted age." [See page 4, paragraph [0034], the categories within specific control settings are defined include, but are not limited to 'Language', 'sex and nudity', 'violence'....]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hillis and Monteverde with that of Dahlstrom because all are related to evaluating and regulating content on the internet and by including the particular types of subject ratings, as disclosed in Dahlstrom, the method is detailed because it can be fine tuned for specific things to look for. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include disclose "the evaluation criterion comprises at least one of sexual content, violent content, adult content, and targeted age."

Claim 28:

The combination of Hillis, Monteverde, and Dahlstrom discloses in Hillis "The method of claim 3, wherein the request is received by at least one of a content provider and a user."[page 5 line 21-22]

13. Claims 8, 9, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Provisional Patent Application 60529245 by Hillis (hereafter Hillis) and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0107363 by Monteverde (hereafter Monteverde) further in view of U.S. Patent 7072888 by Perkins (hereafter Perkins).

Claim 8:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose "the at least one trust score is based on the geographical location of the specific one of the one or more evaluators."

However, Perkins discloses, "the at least one trust score is based on the geographical location of the specific one of the one or more evaluators." [See column 3, lines 50-52, Profiles may include information as to whether the user is a home or a business, geographic location, typical spending, etc.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the Hillis, Monteverde, and Perkins because they all are related to feedback from users and by including geographic location as disclosed in Perkins, the method can be more precise delivering more accurate results. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "at least one trust score is based on the geographical location of the associated specific one of the plurality of evaluators."

Claim 9:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose "at least one trust score is based on one or more prior content ratings received from the specific one of the one or more evaluators."

However, Perkins discloses, "at least one trust score is based on one or more prior content ratings received from the specific one of the one or more evaluators." [See column 12, lines 44 – 48, The profile not only contains information supplied by the user, but also contains information pertaining to the user's previous searches, resources visited and ratings of those resources.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the Hillis, Monteverde, and Perkins because they all are related to feedback from users and by including prior content ratings as disclosed in Perkins, the method can be more precise delivering more accurate results. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "at least one trust score is based on one or more prior content ratings received from the associated specific one of the plurality of evaluators."

Claim 15:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose "at least one trust score is based on at least one of the geographical location of the specific one of the one or more evaluators and prior rating information received from the specific one of the one or more evaluators."

However, Perkins discloses, "at least one trust score is based on at least one of the geographical location of the specific one of the one or more evaluators and prior rating information" (ratings of those resources) "received from the specific one of the one or more evaluators." [See column 3, lines 50-52 Profiles may include information as to whether the user is a home or a business, geographic location, typical spending, etc. And see column 12, lines 44-48 the profile not only contains information supplied by the user, but also contains information

supplied pertaining to the user's pervious searches, resources visited and ratings of those resources.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the Hillis, Monteverde, and Perkins because they all are related to feedback from users and by including geographic location as disclosed in Perkins, the method can be more precise delivering more accurate results. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "at least one of the plurality of trust scores is based on at least one of the geographical location of the associated evaluator and prior rating information received from the evaluator."

14. Claims 11-13, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Provisional Patent Application 60529245 by Hillis (hereafter Hillis) and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0107363 by Monteverde (hereafter Monteverde) further in view of U.S. Patent 2003/0014428 by Mascarenhas (hereafter Mascarenhas).

Claim 11:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose "at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) rating information for the one or more documents received from one or more other evaluators."

However, Mascarenhas discloses, "at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information

for one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) rating information for the one or more documents received from one or more other evaluators." [See page 3, paragraph [0044] An optional interface for acquiring profiles of experts: Input from each expert source may be normalized for certain variables, based on attributes measured for that expert source. For example, mean ratings and distributions collected and analyzed from each expert source may allow that expert's rating input to be expressed as standard deviations from the mean.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine Hillis and Monteverde with that of Mascarenhas because all are related to rating content and by including the rating deviation as disclosed in Mascarenhas, a more accurate method is developed because the scores can be adjusted if they are consistently inconsistent with other evaluators. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) rating information for the one or more documents received from one or more other evaluators."

Claim 12:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose "at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) aggregate ratings for the one or more documents."

However, Mascarenhas discloses "at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) aggregate ratings" [composite rating] "for the one or more documents." [See page 3, paragraph [0044] An optional interface for acquiring profiles of experts: Input from each expert source may be normalized for certain variables, based on attributes measured for that expert source. For example, mean ratings and distributions collected and analyzed from each expert source may allow that expert's rating input to be expressed as standard deviations from the mean. And see page 3, paragraph [0041] A composite rating may be computed from the mean of multiple ratings received under a single taxonomic category.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine Hillis and Monteverde with that of Mascarenhas because all are related to rating content and by including the rating deviation as disclosed in Mascarenhas, a more accurate method is developed because the scores can be adjusted if they are consistently inconsistent with other evaluators. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) rating information for the one or more documents received from one or more other evaluators."

Claim 13:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose "the at least one trust score is based on rating information previously received from the specific one of the one or more evaluators for one or more documents."

However, Mascarenhas discloses "the at least one trust score is based on rating information" (expert's rating input) "previously received from the specific one of the one or more evaluators for one or more documents." [See page 3, paragraph [0044] An optional interface for acquiring profiles of experts: Input from each expert source may be normalized for certain variables, based on attributes measured for that expert source. For example, mean ratings and distributions collected and analyzed from each expert source may allow that expert's rating input to be expressed as standard deviations from the mean. Here, the trust score is based on prior ratings as well.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine Hillis and Monteverde with that of Masçarenhas because all are related to rating content and by including the rating deviation as disclosed in Mascarenhas, a more accurate method is developed because the scores can be adjusted if they are consistently inconsistent with other evaluators. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "the trust score of an evaluator is based on rating information previously received from the evaluator for one or more documents."

Claim 21:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose "receiving new rating information for the document; and processing the new rating information to determine a revised rating associated with the document."

However, Mascarenhas discloses "receiving new rating information for the document; and processing the new rating information to determine a revised rating associated with the document." (See page 14, paragraph [0224] Another user who would review the same document and provide a similar rating could very well select different categories and different significance ratings even for the same categories. In a preferred embodiment, these different significance vector values are averaged and the resulting vector with the averages is saved with the document along with a 'number of raters' value which is used to compute the new average.)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine Hillis and Monteverde with that of Mascarenhas because all are related to rating content and by including the revised rating as disclosed in Mascarenhas, a more accurate rating is developed because the scores are adjusted to consider the new evaluators. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "receiving new rating information for the document; and processing the new rating information to determine a revised rating associated with the document."

15. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Provisional Patent Application 60529245 by Hillis (hereafter Hillis) and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0107363 by Monteverde (hereafter Monteverde) further in

view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 20040199584 by Kirshenbaum (hereafter Kirshenbaum).

Claim 14:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose "determining one or more revised trust scores for one or more of the one or more evaluators; and determining a revised aggregate rating based on the one or more revised trust scores."

However, Kirshenbaum discloses "determining one or more revised trust scores" (credibility) "for one or more of the one or more evaluators" (users) ; and determining a revised aggregate rating based on the one or more revised trust scores." [See page 3, paragraph [0025] Those users (e.g., 12) who have previously provided reliable and useful feedback are given more credibility in their future feedback, and user models change more quickly in response to feedback from more credible users.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention combine Hillis, Monteverde, and Kirshenbaum because all are related to acquiring feedback or ratings on content and by including a revised trust score as taught in Kirshenbaum, the method is more accurate, taking into account that trust scores can change over time. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "determining one or more revised trust scores for one or more of the plurality of evaluators; and determining a revised aggregate rating" (user models) "based on the one or more revised trust scores."

16. Claim 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Provisional Patent Application 60529245 by Hillis (hereafter Hillis) and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0107363 by Monteverde (hereafter Monteverde) further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 20050204276 by Hosea et. al. (hereafter Hosea).

Claim 16:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose "wherein the document is an advertisement."

However, Hosea discloses "the document is an advertisement." [See page 5, paragraph [0043] The components include but are not limited to text, images, advertisements and links to other Web pages.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Hosea with Hillis and Monteverde because all are related to personalization of content and by including advertisements as disclosed in Hillis, the method is optimized to produce better results from the user by showing relevant advertisements. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "the document is an advertisement".

17. Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Provisional Patent Application 60529245 by Hillis (hereafter Hillis) and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0107363 by Monteverde (hereafter Monteverde) further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 20050060404 by Ahlander et. al. (hereafter Ahlander).

Claim 19:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose "the one or more evaluators are selected using a random selection algorithm."

However, Ahlander discloses "the one or more evaluators" [content rater] "are selected using a random selection algorithm." [See page 3, paragraph [0037] A content rater can be selected, for example randomly based on how long the content rater has been idle, based on policies or a rating service provider, etc.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Hillis, Monteverde, and Ahlander because all are related to evaluating content and by including the random selection as disclosed in Ahlander, the method can be more efficient by not needing to review particular criteria before assigning an evaluator. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "the plurality of evaluators are selected using a random selection algorithm."

Claim 20:

Hillis and Monteverde do not explicitly disclose "wherein the criteria comprises a sensitivity score."

However, Ahlander discloses "the criteria comprises a sensitivity score" (threshold rating). [See page 4, paragraph [0050] Threshold rating 213 can be adjusted to increase the amount of content that is assigned a content rating or increase the accuracy associated with assigned content rating.]

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Hillis, Monteverde, and Ahlander because all are related to evaluating content and by including a sensitivity rating as disclosed in Ahlander, the method can be more precise by not allowing certain content through for particularly sensitive users, specifically on issues that are of increased importance. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include "the criteria comprises a sensitivity score."

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1, 3, 5-6, 8-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record listed on PTO-892 and not relied, if any, upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Contact Information

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael D. Pham whose telephone number is (571)272-3924. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Pham
Art Unit 2167
Examiner M.P.

Cam Y. Truong
Art Unit 2162
Primary Examiner
cy

John Cottingham
Art Unit 2167
Supervisor

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100